

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ANTIGUA COLLEGE
OF MEDICINE, a foreign corporation,

Plaintiff,

United States District Court Judge
Patrick J. Duggan, presiding
Michael Hluchaniuk, referral
Case No.: 2:10-cv-10978

V

STEVEN L. WOODWARD,

Defendant.

Eric A. Buikema (P58379) CARDELLI, LANFEAR & BUIKEMA, P.C. Attorneys for Plaintiff 322 W. Lincoln Royal Oak, MI 48067 (248) 544-1100 ebuikema@cardellilaw.com	STEVEN L. WOODWARD In Pro Per c/o 7211 Brittwood Lane Flint, MI 48507 Steve_L_woodward@yahoo.com
---	--

PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS
(Docket No. 32)

As the briefing in the instant case thoroughly presented the facts for the Court, Plaintiff will not belabor the same and will address the issues and deficiencies presented by Defendant's Response to the instant motion for Sanctions (Docket No. 34).

Only a single sentence in Defendant's 50 page response (Docket No. 34) which is relevant to the instant motion for sanctions: "The Defendant filed motions only because of the wrongful action of default and deceit committed by the Plaintiff and their attorney." Defendant

apparently contends that his flagrant violations of the Court's Rules and Orders are solely Plaintiff's doing. The rest of Defendant's brief is his typical diatribe against Plaintiff.

Notably Defendant's response does not address the following issues and deficiencies raised in Plaintiff's Motion:

1. Why Defendant republished his defamatory website without leave of the Court?
2. Why Defendant never filed an answer¹ with the Court despite being advised to do so?
3. Why Defendant filed three separate Motions to Set Aside the Default (Docket Nos. 16, 27 and 28) when the rules provide only for a single such motion?
4. Why Defendant filed four separate frivolous motions for subpoenas (see Docket Nos. 17, 18, 21 and 26; see also Plaintiff's response at Docket Nos. 24 and 31)?
5. Why Defendant filed a frivolous Motion to Strike (Docket No. 30)?
6. Why Defendant filed a frivolous Motion for Injunction (Docket No. 30)?
7. Why Defendant continues to contest liability in violation of the Default?
8. Why Defendant never included a brief in any of his motions as required by LR 7.1(d)?
9. Why Defendant never included any legal support or authority in any of his motions, as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)?
10. Why Defendant made multiple motions for summary judgment, in violation of LR 7.1(b)(2)?
11. Why Defendant never sought concurrence in any of his motions as required by LR 7.1(a)?
12. Why Defendant never included a certificate of service on any of his papers or pleadings as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)?
13. Why Defendant never endeavors to serve Plaintiff with any of his filings as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.

Similarly, but not surprisingly, Defendant's Motion is procedurally defective. It continues to contest liability (contrary to what a defaulted party may do), includes no brief² and is wholly unsupported by law and fact³. Despite having the opportunity to review Plaintiff's motion for sanctions which *inter alia* discussed at least some of Defendant's repeated violations

¹ While Defendant contends that he filed a "Rebuttal" with the Clerk, a quick perusal of the Docket reveals that no such rebuttal was ever filed or ever became part of the record.

² In violation of LR 7.1(d).

³ In violation of Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b).

of the Court Rules, Defendant's response does not comport with the same. Unless the Court sanctions Defendant for his conduct in a manner to deter the same in the future, it will undoubtedly continue.

As nothing in Defendant's Response does anything to rebut or undermine the authority or content of Plaintiff's Motion for Rule 11 Sanctions (Docket No. 32), Plaintiff requests that the Court grant its motion.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Eric A. Buikema
Eric A. Buikema (P58379)
Cardelli, Lanfear & Buikema, P.C.
322 West Lincoln Avenue
Royal Oak, Michigan 48067
(248) 544-1100
ebuikema@cardellilaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing Plaintiff's Reply in Support of its Motion for Rule 11 Sanctions and this Certificate of Service were served upon Steven L. Woodward, Defendant, via his email address Steve_L_woodward@yahoo.com and First Class U.S. mail to Steven Woodward, c/o 7211 Brittwood Lane, Flint, MI 48507 on September 9, 2010.

/s/ Eric A. Buikema
Cardelli, Lanfear, & Buikema, P.C.
322 W. Lincoln
Royal Oak, MI 48067
(248) 544-1100
ebuikema@cardellilaw.com
(P58379)